DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 536 SP 030 633

AUTHOR Kauss, Theodore
TITLE The Master of Arts in Teaching: An Idea Whose Time Has Come Again.
INSTITUTION Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 27p.
AVAILABLE FROM Academy for Educational Development, 1255 23rd St. NW, Washington, DC 20037 (free).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Masters Degrees; *Program Effectiveness; Program Improvement; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

This pamphlet takes a tested Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program from the recent past and relates it to today's circumstances and contexts. The MAT program recruits outstanding liberal arts graduates who have completed little or no undergraduate course work in education and places them in a graduate program that requires the successful completion of advanced study in the academic discipline to be taught, professional education classes, and a clinical-internship program teaching experience. The MAT format is described and its strengths and weaknesses are discussed. Suggestions are made for changes and improvements. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ED301536

The Master of Arts in Teaching

Theodore Kaltsounis

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Theodore Kaltsounis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP030633

AED

The Academy for Educational Development (AED) is a private, nonprofit organization that addresses human development needs through education, communication, and information. Under grants and contracts, AED operates programs for government and international agencies, educational institutions, foundations, and corporations. Since its founding in 1961, AED has conducted projects throughout the United States and in more than 100 countries in the developing world.

In partnership with its clients, AED seeks to increase access to learning, transfer skills and technology, and support institutional development.

For further information about AED publications, contact Frances Hays, publications coordinator.

Stephen F. Moseley
President and Chief Executive Officer

William A. Smith
Executive Vice President and Director,
Social Development Programs

Sharon L. Franz
Senior Vice President and Director,
Education, Exchange, and Student Services

Fuad K. Suleiman
Senior Vice President and Director,
Higher Education and Technical Training Programs

The Master of Arts in Teaching:
An Idea Whose Time Has Come, Again

Theodore Kauss

1988

AED

Introduction

Over the past several years, American schools have been the subject of much attention, criticism, and change. Since the turn of the decade, a large number of national, regional, state, and local studies have examined almost anything and everything about the schools. Some of them targeted a particular level of school such as the high school; others focused on special populations of students such as children at risk; still others alerted us to deficiencies in science and mathematics education. Together, these studies, and the reports based on them, helped the nation realize once more the importance of access to and the quality of public schools as they help students become productive workers, caring adults and parents, good neighbors, and informed and active citizens. In community after community, state after state, as well as nationally, education was once more a commanding priority.

This attention did not mean all was well with the education offered by our schools. More was being demanded of them — education to prepare students for workplaces that require greater capacity to think, education for citizenship to deal with an increasingly complex society, education to complement and supplement skills and attitudes once learned in homes and neighborhoods, and education to help build harmony and understanding in a pluralistic society. Many of these demands challenged schools not only to enable students to acquire more knowledge but also to approach knowledge more critically.

Not surprisingly, some of these demands presented challenges directly to teachers, while others challenged society about teachers. Among the latter was that of meeting a growing shortage of teachers. But, the challenge of meeting the need for more teachers was joined by the expectation that they should be qualitatively better. The pleas were for teachers who would be better educated and trained, particularly in ways to improve

the intellectual performance of students. Some of these reports aimed squarely at meeting this challenge by reforming teacher education. From these studies came a flow of proposals, plans, and pleas for changes in teacher education — from the recruiting of students for teacher education and training programs to the certification and licensing of teachers.

Calls for reforming the education of teachers are hardly news. Teacher education has long been the subject of attention and change. The history of teacher education in this country is replete with studies, findings, recommendations, and changes. One such change was the introduction by a few universities — Harvard and Northwestern to name two — in the mid-1930s of efforts to recruit and train teachers from among liberal arts graduates. Because teachers were in great supply — it was the Depression — these modest efforts at graduate teacher education all but disappeared by World War II.

The post-war era, with the baby boom and Sputnik, gave rise to a need for more teachers, especially for teachers with a strong and substantial background in various academic disciplines. As a result, teacher education at the graduate level was given light and life in the 1950s and early 1960s by the Fund for the Advancement of Education, a Ford Foundation-funded grant-making organization, and the Ford Foundation itself under the so-called "breakthrough in teacher education" program. This effort supported "breakthrough" projects in over 40 colleges and universities. Their purpose was to attract recent liberal arts graduates into the teaching profession to earn the Master of Arts in Teaching degree (or the M.A.T. as it came to be known) through a combination of some post-baccalaureate course work and a teaching internship. This multimillion dollar effort was represented by examples across the country and in various kinds of institutions — public and private, college and university. Each year these institutions

graduated hundreds of teachers, who, in turn, demonstrated their worth as solid teachers. Today, however, many of these programs are no longer active, in part, because of costs, but also because of the oversupply of teachers in the 1970s and early 1980s as the babies from the post-war boom graduated from high school.

Now there are calls once more for teacher education at the graduate level. Two notable examples of reports making such recommendations appeared in 1986. They are *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group* (a group of education deans in research universities) and *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, a report of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Recommendations of this kind are not new to Theodore Kauss, Vice President and Executive Director of The Frost Foundation, Ltd., the author of the piece that follows. He has been making the case for graduate teacher education for many years, starting from the time he was directly engaged in an M.A.T. program at Northwestern University. There he had first-hand knowledge of the value of such a program for teachers and schools. Subsequently in his foundation career, he has advocated this approach to teacher education and, in 1984, he prepared the piece I am privileged to introduce. Later, in May of 1985, Kauss publicly delivered this paper at the Bar Harbor Colloquium on Teacher Education, a meeting that was co-sponsored by the Academy for Educational Development and College of the Atlantic, Bar Harbor, Maine.

I urge you to read this paper. In a straightforward way, it takes a tested teacher education program from the recent past and relates it to today's circumstances and contexts. You should not think of it as a case of "rediscovering the wheel" or a matter of "what goes around, comes around." Rather, you will realize

that it is the sound conclusion of a thoughtful observer and participant who wisely argues that "what once was" is, perhaps, "what ought to be."

Edward J. Meade, Jr.
Chief Program Officer
The Ford Foundation

April 1988

The Master of Arts in Teaching:
An Idea Whose Time Has Come, Again

Theodore Kauss

Schools today ain't as good as they used to be—
and I guess they never was.

—Will Rogers

Although negative attacks on teacher training programs and positive attempts to improve the system of teaching preparation in the United States have been with us for centuries, the decade of the 1980s may be recognized as the period when foes and friends of teacher education programs finally joined forces for a common goal — to provide educational excellence in our schools through the professional efforts of outstanding instructors. Why now? Of the many reasons and factors, two seem to stand out: the release in April 1983 of the report *Our Nation at Risk*, compiled by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, and the decision by the President of the United States to make education a major issue for his re-election campaign. *Our Nation at Risk* seems to leap out of the

Theodore Kauss has been Vice President and Executive Director of The Frost Foundation, a Denver-based philanthropic organization, since 1977. Before joining The Frost Foundation, he held several administrative posts at Centenary College of Louisiana during the period 1972 - 1977, including executive vice president, dean of the college, and acting president. Earlier he served as a senior associate with the management consulting firm of Cresap, McCormick and Paget and as director of the M.A.T. program and professor of education administration at Northwestern University. Dr. Kauss was also a teacher and administrator in the public schools of his native state, Wisconsin.

In 1988, Dr. Kauss added comments to update this paper, which he originally presented in 1985.

plethora of education-related reports to capture the attention of leaders in government, business, education, and — more important — the interest of the general public.

The report addressed the problems and opportunities facing American education and offered recommendations for improvement in the areas of curriculum, content, standards and expectations, time for the "New Basics," and improvement of teaching, leadership, and fiscal support. The following statement from the report was intended to activate our senses for survival:

> The educational foundations of society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people. What was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur — others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments.
>
> If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves.

As a result of the impact of *Our Nation at Risk* (dubbed "Sputnik '83"), college and university professors and administrators, K-12 teachers and officials, and advocates and adversaries of American teacher education are generating a great deal of heat and a glimmer of light regarding the best format for preparing the teachers and scholars critically needed for our nation's classrooms. Even though their concerted efforts to find innovative solutions are commendable, I believe that they are looking in the wrong direction. The formula they seek is not something that must be created in the future. Instead, it is something of quality from our past — the Master of Arts in Teaching program or the M.A.T. This program has its roots in the teacher education units of Harvard and Northwestern Universities as far back as the mid-1930s, but it was almost a generation later that it emerged as, arguably, the best teacher training format ever designed and implemented.

Although there is not a "universal" M.A.T. plan, the basic components are essentially the same from program to program. The M.A.T. program recruits outstanding liberal arts graduates who have completed little or no undergraduate course work in education and places them in a graduate program that requires the successful completion of advanced study in the academic discipline to be taught, professional education classes, and a clinical-internship teaching experience. Generally, M.A.T. programs have attempted to select prospective teachers who possessed the sensitivity and compassion to be concerned with the personal and emotional growth of students and with their academic and intellectual progress.

The Origins of the M.A.T.

The M.A.T. concept was conceived at Harvard University in 1935 and the program, which they identified as the A.M.T., was initiated there in 1936. The program received the active support of Harvard's president, James Conant. Conant recognized the need to prepare secondary school teachers who were versed in the views of the academicians and the professional educators. The acceptance of the Harvard program was an important breakthrough because the entire community of scholars became involved in the preservice education of teachers. In a sense, this interdisciplinary involvement bridged a gap between liberal arts professors and professional educators.

Harvard's program served as a model in teacher training for many institutions. However, because teachers were in oversupply and there was little incentive for liberal arts graduates to make additional investments of time and money to prepare for the low-salaried teaching positions which were then available (this has a familiar ring to it), this prototype project met with only moderate success during the 1930s and 1940s and was eventually deactivated.

These conditions closely paralleled those encountered by the graduate internship program offered by Northwestern University in 1935. In 1933, the faculty and administration of Northwestern's School of Education were concerned about the pressing need for more and better-prepared teachers for elementary and secondary schools. In 1935, through cooperative actions by the faculty and administration of the School of Education and the Graduate School, the Graduate-Internship program for the preparation of teachers was developed.

The basic purpose of the program was to offer college or university graduates who demonstrated high academic ability an opportunity, through a fifth year of study (actually five quarters), to prepare themselves for a teaching career. The program was designed to enable qualified applicants (1) to pursue graduate study in academic subjects, (2) to engage in practice teaching under professional supervision, (3) to develop professional competencies through teaching internships, (4) to fulfill the requirements for the Master of Arts in Education or Master of Arts in Teaching degree, and (5) to complete the requirements for state teaching certification.

The Graduate-Internship program at Northwestern was inaugurated in the 1935 summer session. The first and second summer sessions required full-time study in academic and professional areas related to selecting a teaching position. The intervening academic year required a combined program of classroom teaching under supervision and part-time graduate study. An internship in teaching at a cooperating school in the Chicago metropolitan area constituted what was then a unique feature of this academic and professional program. The Northwestern program operated successfully for a decade, but World War II created conditions which caused its termination at the end of the 1945 summer session — ironically, just before the end of the war.

12

Although Harvard and Northwestern discontinued their A.M.T. and Graduate-Internship programs, the underlying purposes for originating the programs still existed and numerous educators were convinced that conventional teacher training programs, heavily weighted with courses on professional education, were not attractive to many bright college students.

Our distinguished moderator, Frank Keppel, while serving as dean of Harvard's Graduate School of Education, wrote in the December 1952 issue of the *Journal of Teacher Education* that M.A.T. programs are based on the conviction that good teaching requires four basic elements: (1) a sound liberal education, (2) a thorough mastery of the academic field in which the candidate expects to teach, (3) an understanding of the role of schools in society, and (4) a mastery of the teaching process. Other educators in agreement with Frank believed that these four requisites could not be met consistently without a redefinition of the structure of conventional teacher education programs. Traditionally, teacher education had been perceived as having two distinct elements: the academic and the professional or technical. Rather than seek a compromise between the two traditions, it seemed imperative to these educators to arrive at a synthesis of the academic and professional elements. The M.A.T. format provided a vehicle for the achievement of this merger.

Similarly, some major private foundations recognized that the attraction and retention of gifted teachers was one of the basic problems facing education. In particular, the Ford Foundation Fund for the Advancement of Education considered it essential to revitalize the education of prospective teachers. Thus, representatives of the Fund urged the recruitment of outstanding liberal arts students for the teaching profession and offered funding for scholarships and related program support.

In keeping with these convictions, in 1951 the Fund presented to Harvard University a grant to support the rejuvenation of its M.A.T.-type program, which was again identified as the A.M.T. program. In the same year, the Fund also made a substantial contribution to the University of Arkansas to establish a fifth-year program of teaching internship and professional study. Other programs which received Ford Foundation financial support at that time included those at Cornell University, Temple University, and the University of Louisville.

A Carnegie Corporation grant helped initiate an M.A.T. program at Yale University in 1951. Wesleyan University (Connecticut) received Carnegie support for its program a year later. During the next decade, M.A.T. programs at other schools, including Northwestern University, were implemented with financial assistance from private foundations.

The M.A.T. programs were extremely successful in the 1960s. By 1968 more than 100 programs were in operation. However, for reasons to be discussed later in this paper, their popularity waned between 1972 and 1980, when many of the programs were terminated, with such prominent dropouts as Duke, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Northwestern, Reed, Wesleyan, and Yale. Although the M.A.T. program was eventually phased out by these outstanding institutions, the M.A.T. format was generally praised by their faculties.

The M.A.T. Format

The Master of Arts in Teaching Program is designed to attract very bright liberal arts graduates by offering them a program combining professional training with a concentration of course work in an academic major. The program's underlying philosophy is based upon the idea of the teacher-scholar who possesses effective and imaginative teaching techniques as well as the potential and desire for continuous intellectual growth. M.A.T. advocates believe that the realization of this idea requires formal study beyond the baccalaureate. Standard teacher education curricula are considered inadequate because the four-year program tends to minimize the importance of the academic major while it emphasizes pedagogy. Conversely, liberal arts students may possess a depth of knowledge in a particular discipline, but have insufficient background in professional education. The M.A.T. format provides the liberal arts graduate with the opportunity to become successful as a teacher and as a scholar. Although the M.A.T. was initially restricted to aspiring secondary-level teachers, some programs were developed for elementary teachers. Some of these programs received grant support from special U.S. Government programs.

The Master of Arts in Teaching program has been recognized by leading authorities in the field of education as one of the significant innovations in teacher education during the past fifty years. Many of those involved in the various aspects of the program have voiced their support for and satisfaction with the program.

While the Ford Foundation has recently commissioned a survey of M.A.T. graduates,* the limited research previously conducted on the program, to my knowledge, was completed prior to 1970. These findings indicated that some M.A.T.s moved from the classroom to administrative posts and others chose graduate programs that took them to college teaching or other fields such as law, medicine, and business. Of course, some remained in elementary and secondary school teaching. Nevertheless, many of these bright and talented individuals, with their missionary zeal to be educators, did serve for five years or so as instructors in our nation's classrooms and influenced thousands of students who benefited from their knowledge, enthusiasm, and ability.

The studies completed between the late 1950s and the late 1960s concerning the M.A.T. model also measured the success of the program based on the opinions and judgments of the people most directly involved: the M.A.T. graduates and the administrators who employed them.

Ernest Stabler of Wesleyan reported in the July 1960 issue of *The Educational Record* that Wesleyan conducted a survey involving their M.A.T. graduates with two years of teaching experience. Results showed that 87 percent of those questioned were satisfied with the teaching load. The tone and atmosphere

---

*Author's note: The aforementioned Ford Foundation follow-up study of M.A.T. programs, *A Look at the M.A.T. Model of Teacher Education and Its Graduates: Lessons for Today*, was completed by the Educational Testing Service and released in December 1985. Under the heading "Policy Implications and Recommendations," the co-authors of the Ford Foundation study, Richard J. Coley and Margaret E. Thorpe, state: "Given the current climate of concern about education, the M.A.T. model appears to be a viable one to increase the supply and quality of the nation's teachers. But, while the M.A.T.s were prepared to teach 'mainstream students,' modern efforts should recognize the changing composition of the nation's school population and tailor recruitment and training accordingly." They have in a nutshell identified the key adjustments which must be made to strengthen the M.A.T. format in order to prepare classroom teachers for the 21st Century.

of the schools were rated good or very good by 93 percent. The overwhelming majority also agreed that pupil responsiveness was good. Most graduates believed that as teachers they had great freedom in the classrooms. None of the graduates questioned planned to leave the field of education, although 65 percent said that they wanted administrative jobs in a few years. The conclusions indicated that, on the whole, these teachers were satisfied with their jobs, their schools, and their status in the community.

Studies conducted at Yale, as reported by William P. Holden in the *Journal of Teacher Education* in December 1959, also presented positive reports. While the Wesleyan study evaluated post-graduate responses, the Yale studies consisted of program evaluations by interns and appraisals of the interns by their principals. There was almost universal approval of the program among interns. They particularly liked the "balanced program" of subject and professional courses. Although a few considered the education courses to be of limited use, the majority found them valuable.

Principals responding to the questionnaire were favorably impressed by the M.A.T. interns. When asked to compare M.A.T.s with teachers of "similar" experience, principals rated the M.A.T. interns superior by a vote of more than two to one.

A study I completed in 1968 included an analysis of Northwestern's Master of Arts in Teaching program. Value judgments concerning the effectiveness of the M.A.T. at Northwestern University were received from 1962 - 1966 graduates of the program and department chairmen representing school districts which employed former M.A.T.s. The value judgments were analyzed to determine how well the program met its objectives and how valuable it was perceived to be by former participants.

Data were gathered through the use of two questionnaires. One questionnaire was sent to former Northwestern University M.A.T.s who participated in the program during the 1961 - 1965 school years. Addresses were available for 182 of the 266 former interns. One hundred and twenty-three (or 68 percent) of these completed and returned their questionnaires. Responses were received concerning (1) personal data, (2) student teaching, (3) internship teaching, and (4) university course work.

The second questionnaire was sent to 118 public school department chairpersons who worked directly with graduates of Northwestern University's M.A.T. program. Eighty-five returned the questionnaire, or 72 percent of the total sample. This instrument elicited evaluation of former M.A.T.s in the following areas: (1) knowledge of subject matter, (2) ability to teach subject matter, and (3) skill in discipline and classroom management. The observers' prognoses regarding the former interns' success in the field of education and suggestions for modifications of Northwestern's M.A.T. program were also included.

Although the findings suggested that a majority of M.A.T. graduates were not satisfied with all the components of the program, many former M.A.T.s responded that the format offered them a practical and effective means of accomplishing educational and career objectives, including graduate course work in a selected discipline, certification for secondary school employment, and a full-time teaching position. Most department chairpersons in the employing schools praised the M.A.T. product and the program.

Both evaluating groups recommended that courses in methods and techniques be expanded to emphasize practical approaches and solutions to problems encountered by neophyte teachers. There was general agreement that the M.A.T. program should

continue to attempt to improve the quality of teaching in school systems through the selection and preparation for teaching of recent college graduates with strong academic backgrounds.

Specific Solutions

On March 1 of this year (1985), the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, an independent commission established a year ago by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, issued its report, *A Call for Change in Teacher Education*. This report has not achieved the acclaim of *Our Nation at Risk* and has not attracted the attention of the general public as have some of the President's pronouncements on education.

However, this recent study is more specific in its directives to those involved in and concerned with the academic programs and clinical experiences necessary for the professional preparation of America's teachers. As a result of this specificity, and the movement already underway to upgrade teacher training across the board, this recent report may provide the impetus needed to reinstate the M.A.T. as the exemplary design for our teacher education programs for the remainder of this century and perhaps beyond. Although the report does not recommend requiring a year of post-baccalaureate study for teacher certification, some of its recommendations and suggestions point to the need for this fifth year and to the importance of a strong liberal arts base for all teachers, especially those teaching in secondary schools. For instance, the importance of liberal education, subject specialization, professional education, and internship experiences were emphasized in the study, as represented by the following excerpts in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* of March 6, 1985:

Recommendations:
Programs for Teacher Education

Recommendation #4: Each teacher education program should be an exacting, intellectually challenging integration of liberal studies, subject specialization from which school curricula are drawn, and content and skills of professional education.

For the Programs for Teacher Education, the Commission's primary focus of study was the proper education of the teacher; program length and placement became issues when we identified what would be necessary for capable students to achieve such an education. We maintain that teachers should have a liberal education equivalent to that of the best-educated members of their community, not simply a few courses in each of several general academic fields; that teachers should know and understand the intellectual and practical content from which curricula are drawn, not simply become familiar with their portion of a school's curriculum; that teachers should have both the skills to teach and the knowledge of the research and experiential bases for those skills, not simply a set of prescriptions for what to do under various classroom circumstances.

We agreed that a program to prepare teachers must be coherent and sequential. Its intellectual demands for its students should be commensurate with the requirements of excellent teaching, not with the level of ability of the least capable student who applies for admission. Likewise, only professors, supervisors, and cooperating teachers who adhere to such standards for themselves and their students should be permitted to work in the program.

Adoption of Recommendation #4 will demand longer programs than most colleges and universities now require. (Some states already require an additional year after the baccalaureate that combines student teaching and pedagogical study.) We urge that, as states review their certification requirements and colleges and universities study their programs, they let the educational needs of teachers determine the length of teacher education programs. We particularly encourage those colleges and universities offering only a baccalaureate degree and those having graduate programs to explore mutually beneficial arrangements that will permit all highly qualified students desiring to become teachers to complete the best program possible.

Recommendation #5: Following their completion of a teacher education program and the awarding of a provisional certificate, new teachers should complete an induction period or internship of at least a year's duration for which compensation is provided.

> We advise all states to develop for teacher candidates an internship or other induction experience beyond the provisional certification requirement. During this period, the school, the profession, and higher education should work together to help the new teacher become successfully immersed in the teaching profession. Because the provisionally certified teachers will render real teaching services, compensation is justified much as it is in other professions that require internships. Interns, however, should have reduced teaching loads so that they have time to participate in professional development activities, including seminars.

The essential elements of Recommendation #4 are integral parts of the M.A.T. design, which demands, in almost all instances, a B.A. degree in liberal arts; a general understanding of the teacher's world through a blend of educational theory, practice, foundations, and research; clinical experience under the tutelage of cooperating teachers, supervisors, and professors who themselves are excellent role models; and the need for a longer (fifth-year) period of preparation. Other key components of the M.A.T. format are evident in Recommendation #5. They are provisional certification, paid internships, and reduced teaching loads (Northwestern's M.A.T.s carried a three-fifths reduced teaching load) to facilitate participation in professional development, including seminars.

The obvious question is, "If the M.A.T. can be considered the ideal format for programs in pedagogy, why was it dropped by many of our premier institutions after several decades of successful operation?" There are several reasons. A number of universities accepted the challenge of innovation but rejected the duties of maintenance. That is, they were committed to offering an experimental program but were not interested in providing a program which, at least for them, had become routine. Other institutions felt that the loss of "soft money" (and prestige) when foundation and government grants to their programs were terminated made it no longer feasible to offer the program. Still others decided that their academic and

budgetary priorities should be moved to areas other than teacher education. In addition, the critical teacher shortage in our country during the 1960s, when many M.A.T. programs were initiated and nurtured, became teacher surpluses in the 1970s. These surpluses, along with a need to reduce expenses, caused some school systems to return to less expensive hiring practices, which were directed at recruiting new teachers from the pool of graduates of undergraduate education programs.

Perhaps the major reason for the decline (and in some cases the demise) of the M.A.T. in the 1970s is that the population boom subsided and many school systems nationwide were forced to close buildings and dismiss professional staff, including tenured teachers. Obviously, hiring paid interns, even at the 60 percent rate of a beginning teacher, in the face of cutbacks and retrenchments was an indefensible approach for many administrators. Besides, just as Harvard discovered in the 1930s and 1940s, many college students who considered pursuing the M.A.T. were discouraged — and as a result turned to other professions — because few teaching jobs were available to them after graduation.

The M.A.T. Mandate

The potential pool of M.A.T.s is even deeper in talent today because of a greater interest on the part of mid-career professionals, male and female, in fields outside of education who want to become teachers. Harvard started a graduate program in the fall of 1983 for aspiring teachers with strong backgrounds and successful experiences in the fields of math and science. This program attracts people in their forties, fifties, and sixties who have met certain family obligations, attained many of their career goals, and are financially in a position to do what they want to do — namely, teach. Although the new Harvard program is not officially the M.A.T. (or A.M.T.), it is

close in concept and practice. Following on the heels of this experimental project, similar programs have been established at other major institutions such as the University of Colorado.

Primarily because of our need for quality in classroom teaching (quantity might also be a consideration in light of projections of teacher shortages within a couple of years), the M.A.T. program is obviously an idea whose time has come, again. Since we now have the M.A.T. mandate, it is worth asking what basic steps must be taken to reinstate, establish, or enhance programs across the country.

Undoubtedly, any listing of procedures for change will seem to be oversimplified, because dropping undergraduate teacher education programs will cause waves (or even shock waves) on many of our campuses and in some school districts. After all, it could result in the elimination of some professorships. Also, students in teacher education programs would feel the effects of this change because they would have to spend an extra year and extra dollars for a five-year program (even if partial tuition scholarships and part-time paid internships were available). Moreover, school systems would undoubtedly have to upgrade salary schedules to accommodate all the starting teachers with M.A.T. training and clinical experience. Additionally, graduate schools will generally accept only those students with solid B and above averages for admission to the M.A.T.

There is one final hurdle to the widespread conversion to an M.A.T. format: the certification standards of the states. If all the reports of prominent commissions, the results of public opinion polls, and the remarks of our President and other high-level officials are valued, each state will accept the charge to change certification standards to require the fifth-year M.A.T. degree as the entry-level teaching requirement for our elementary and secondary classrooms. A similar type of

nationwide action was accomplished through legislation some twenty years ago when the last of the two-year teacher training programs became extinct with the elimination of the county normal schools. Amazingly, there were many who protested this action, using the same basic arguments mentioned above. Due to a teacher shortage in some regions, this change was not as rapid as planned, but eventually it was completed. I hope that lawmakers in the next couple of years will resist using a possible teacher shortage in some subject areas and grade levels as an excuse to delay the implementation of the mandatory M.A.T. degree for all beginning teachers hired after the 1990-91 school year.

Unfortunately, the impetus for the elimination of undergraduate teacher training programs might have to come from the lawmakers instead of the educators. Actually, many states now require a master's degree of their K-12 teachers within a five-year period after entering the profession. However, as a positive thinker, I wish to envision the following scenario for retooling teacher preparation programs.

First of all, those responsible for undergraduate teacher training will accept that M.A.T. programs for preparing entry-level K-12 teachers are vital for the long-term good of all aspects of education in America. Then the appropriate committees of the education colleges, schools, or departments will meet with their liberal arts colleagues and public school administrators to form the kind of partnership needed to ensure the enduring success of the program. This will result in an agreement to phase out existing B.S. programs for teacher certification during the 1980s, and to replace them with the M.A.T. Then representatives of our colleges and universities will take their case to the major and mid-sized private foundations of America, including those that helped the M.A.T.s in the 1950s and 1960s. In a sense, this will be the original support system revisited — with a

similar story but a greater sense of urgency. It's my educated guess that these potential funders will be receptive to requests for grants for M.A.T. scholarship and program support and would consider continuing this assistance into the next century. Through the dedicated efforts and generous contributions of these key players, our leading colleges and universities will be able to provide the quintessential teacher preparation program required to remove mediocrity from our elementary and secondary schools and replace it with excellence — the M.A.T.

Board of Directors, 1988–1989

Gerald R. Ford, Honorary Chairman of the Board; President of the United States, 1974–1976

Robert O. Anderson, Chairman of the Board; President, Hondo Oil and Gas Company

Sol M. Linowitz, Vice Chairman of the Board; Senior Counsel, Coudert Brothers; former U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States; former Chairman of the Board, Xerox Corporation

Stephen F. Moseley, President and Chief Executive Officer

Joseph S. Iseman, Secretary of the Corporation; Counsel to Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison

John Brademas, President, New York University; former U.S. Congressman

Thornton F. Bradshaw, Consultant to the RCA Corporation; former Chairman of the Board, RCA Corporation

Jack G. Clarke, Senior Vice President and Director, Exxon Corporation

Alonzo A. Crim, Superintendent of Schools, Atlanta, Georgia

John Diebold, Chairman of the Board, The Diebold Group, Inc.

John T. Dorrance, Jr., Chairman of the Executive Committee and former Chairman of the Board, Campbell Soup Company

Khodadad Farmanfarmaian, former Chairman of the Board, Bank Sanaye-Iran, Teheran, Iran

Luther H. Foster, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Moton Memorial Institute, Inc.; former President, Tuskegee Institute

Marie Davis Gadsden, Deputy Director, National Association for Equal Opportunity/A.I.D. Cooperative Agreement; former Vice President and Director, Phelps-Stokes Fund, Washington Bureau

William C. Greenough, former Chairman, Teachers Insurance and Annuities Association

John A. Hannah, President Emeritus, Michigan State University

Fred M. Hechinger, President, The New York Times Company Foundation

Frederick S. Humphries, President, Florida A & M University

J. E. Jonsson, Honorary Chairman of the Board, Texas Instruments, Inc.

Theodore W. Kheel, Partner, Battle, Fowler, Lidstone, Jaffin, Pierce, and Kheel

F. David Mathews, President, Kettering Foundation; former U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

Mary S. Metz, President, Mills College

James E. O'Brien, Of Counsel, Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro

James A. Perkins, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, International Council for Educational Development

Frank H. T. Rhodes, President, Cornell University

Joseph E. Slater, President Emeritus and Senior Fellow, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies; Chairman, The John J. McCloy International Center

Willard Wirtz, Partner, Friedman and Wirtz; former U.S. Secretary of Labor

Founder

Alvin C. Eurich (1902–1987), President and Chief Executive Officer

Headquarters:

Academy for Educational
Development, Inc.
1255 Twenty-third St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
Telephone: (202) 862-1900
Telex: 197601 ACADED WSH
Telefax: (202) 862-1947

New York Office:

Academy for Educational
Development, Inc.
100 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10011
Telephone: (212) 243-1110
Telefax: (212) 627-0407